



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

supposes, horsemen. Also *élytre* p. 134, the outer hard covering of an insect's wings, and *gypaète* p. 235, a vulture. On the half-dozen puzzling proper names of which the editors offer no explanation, I can add but little. There is a mountain *Falu* in Sweden which may have suggested the name but cannot be the *Mont Falu* of *Guitare*. The *Béit* of *Béit-Cifrésil* and *Abdallah-Béit* is doubtless the English Bey and *Abdallah* (servant of God) is a fairly common Mohammedan name occurring occasionally in the history of Cairo, but I have been unable to discover any name even approximating *Cifrésil* or any record of the building of a well such as is referred to in *La Rose de l'Infante*, p. 165, ll. 21-23. *Jérimadeth* in *Booz endormi*, p. 163, l. 21, occurring as it does in one of the most famous passages in all Hugo's poetry, deserves attention. The word does not occur in the Bible, nor is it to be found in the maps and guide-books of Palestine, so we may be constrained to accept the pun proposed by Grillet, *La Bible dans Victor Hugo* (Lyon, 1910), p. 226.—For *Sinnagog*, p. 157, see Berret, *Le Moyen Age dans la Légende des Siècles* (Paris, 1911), p. 30.—*Teb*, p. 111, and *Moganez*, p. 90, remain unsolved problems. In throwing light on the large number of other difficult and recondite allusions the editors have shown much patience and scholarship and deserve the thanks of all readers of Hugo.

CHRISTIAN GAUSS.

Princeton University.

The Tudor Drama. A history of English national drama to the retirement of Shakespeare. By C. F. TUCKER BROOKE. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1911. Pp. xii, 228.

It might be thought impossible at this time of day to write anything really fresh on this subject; but Mr. Brooke is entitled to the credit of this difficult achievement. It is not in the earlier and less developed part of the field that his success lies. Indeed, he remarks with a

touch of flippancy not altogether justified, and perhaps not intended, that "the origin of the modern European theatre in the services of the medieval church is matter of common knowledge, and the connection has perhaps received already more explanation than it requires" (p. 2). Mr. Brooke gives indeed a fair summary of the easily accessible sources of information as to the development of the drama from the Roman liturgy, but the subject stands in need of a good deal more investigation and explanation than it has yet received, and it will be surprising if in the course of a few years Mr. Brooke's account of the matter does not appear obviously defective. It is in the Elizabethan period that Mr. Brooke does his best work—partly, no doubt, because he is best acquainted with it, and partly because of the nature of the material with which he has to deal. At first sight this field might seem to have been most worked and to have attracted the most capable workers; but an opening was left for just such a volume of four or five hundred pages as Mr. Brooke has succeeded in writing. The distinguishing features of the Elizabethan drama are its astonishing vitality, variety, and complexity, and there is perhaps no better or more rational way of setting forth the facts than the method of Dr. Ward's *History of English Dramatic Literature*; and yet there is a danger that the student may come away from its perusal with the erroneous impression of an orderly chronological development—from liturgical drama to miracle plays, from miracles to moral plays, from moralities to interludes and histories, and so on to regular comedy and tragedy, the older types disappearing to make way for the new. Professor Schelling succeeds in giving the right impression of the synchronous development of very different forms of dramatic art in his *Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1642*, and Mr. Brooke's little volume is in this respect particularly effective, partly on account of its size, but mainly because of the skill with which he has woven together the diverse threads of influence and interest. For a right understanding of the subject, it is assuredly imperative that we should realize that

the older forms continued to exist alongside of the newer developments from them, and that the native drama was not superseded by plays copied from foreign or classical models. Our one detailed description of the way in which the miracle plays were acted is given by Archdeacon Rogers of Chester, who died in 1595; the Chester cycle, we know, was acted as late as 1575, and all five manuscripts date from the period 1591-1607. The moralities continued to be acted and to be published, in spite of the competition of the regular theatres, *The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality* being printed in 1602, after a performance before the Queen, apparently on February 4th, 1601. Mr. Brooke says:

'The later moralities were usually performed by companies of four or five men and a boy,—the boy, of course, taking women's parts. These troupes, once formed, continued themselves in unbroken sequence till the Restoration. There seems no doubt that the strolling players of the Commonwealth who roamed from village to village with their contraband dramatic wares, after the suppression of the theatres in 1642, were the lineal descendants, and the inheritors of many a piece of traditional clownage and stage business from those who in pre-Tudor times performed "The Castle of Perseverance."' (p. 58.)

The importance of the native element in *Ralph Roister Doister* is suitably emphasized by Mr. Brooke and he also draws attention to the combination of native realism, classical structure, and Italian romance in *Misogonus*, now convincingly ascribed by Professor Kittredge to Lawrence Johnson, who preceded M. A. at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1577. In the development of tragedy, Mr. Brooke rightly concludes that the most indispensable factor was the example of the Latin classic model, but he does not overlook the importance of the native and popular elements which contributed most materially to the vitality of the new form of art and prepared the way for its acceptance on the popular stage. His estimate of the relative importance and precise impact of the Senecan influence is excellent. He describes *The Spanish Tragedie* as "in many ways a

much truer representative of Seneca than confessed imitations like *Ferrex and Porrex*." This seems to be putting the case strongly, but it is not an exaggeration in the sense intended. Kyd gave Senecan tragedy currency and carrying power. He adopted all the features suitable to the popular stage—the horrors and sensationalism, ghosts and furies, madmen and desperate villains, stirring rhetoric, poetical description, and philosophical reflection,—so far as he could, and so far as the public would tolerate them; and he added elements which gave this form of dramatic art a vitality which carried it throughout the great Elizabethan period, and indeed down to our own time. It may be questioned, however, whether the attainment of perfection in the Senecan style should not be given rather to *Titus Andronicus*. In general the two dramas belong to the same Senecan school; there are quotations from Seneca's Latin text in *Titus Andronicus*, as there are in *The Spanish Tragedie*, and there are also passages imitated from Seneca. There are in both plays sensational horrors; but Kyd, as Mr. Boas has pointed out, "never glances at the grosser side of sexual relationships." *Titus Andronicus* deals largely with this theme, and so does Seneca. The highly polished versification, the lively touches of natural description, and the weight and beauty of the reflective passages—the redeeming qualities of *Titus Andronicus* which are absent from Kyd's work—are Senecan characteristics. In the passages imitated from Seneca in *Titus Andronicus*, the resemblance in tone and style is no less striking than the identity of content. Shakspeare, indeed, in his earlier plays has succeeded in catching the tone and manner of Seneca better than any previous imitator, and, it may be added, better than any imitator or translator since. As Churton Collins says, "in his earlier plays, where the influence of Seneca is more perceptible, Shakespeare's style is often as near a counterpart in English of Seneca's style in Latin as can be."

Mr. Brooke is also justified in the remark, which at first appears an exaggeration, that *Romeo and Juliet* belongs fundamentally to the

progeny of Senecan tragedy (p. 221); and it may be added to the arguments he has adduced in support of this assertion that Shakspeare seems to have made in this play a conscious though slight concession to classical convention by the use of the chorus and the concentration of the action. Generally, in dealing with Shakspeare, Mr. Brooke experiences the same difficulty as previous historians of the Elizabethan drama; Shakspeare must stand with his fellows, and yet it seems impossible to portray him adequately without allowing him to crowd the others into the corners of the picture. Mr. Brooke has met the difficulty (it can hardly be said that he has solved it) by reducing Shakspeare a great deal below scale; but this is perhaps an inevitable defect, and one that can be very readily supplied elsewhere. Mention should be made of an interesting suggestion with respect to the much-discussed "War of the Theatres" and the purge which in *The Return from Parnassus* Shakspeare is said to have given to Ben Jonson. As this is a point of considerable interest, Mr. Brooke may well be allowed to speak for himself, after congratulations that so young a scholar has been able to deal adequately and freshly with an exceedingly complicated and apparently well worn subject:—

'I do not know that the reference to the purge in this Cambridge play has been definitely associated hitherto with the fact that "Hamlet" was acted, as the title-page of the first quarto (1603) tells us, not only in London, but "also in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and elsewhere." This announcement, together with the mention in the text itself of the travelling of the players, seems to point to a tour of the Globe Company before the end of 1601. Now the allusion to the "Purge" in the "Return from Parnassus" is of such a nature as to make it almost certain that the audience fully understood the reference. I believe that the passage was intended to recall some clearly expressed rebuke of Jonson in the text of "Hamlet" as recently acted in Cambridge. To be sure, as the latter play is preserved, it contains no distinct anti-Jonsonian stroke; but that fact is easily explained. It should be remembered that the earliest (1603) version of "Hamlet" contains only an excessively abbreviated mention of the theatri-

cal war; while the later quartos of 1604, etc., though certainly based on the true complete copy, purposely omit the twenty most significant lines concerning the "little eyases." The reason for the non-appearance of these lines in all editions except the 1623 Folio, is obviously the same as that which prevented Jonson from publishing his Apologetical Dialogue to "The Poetaster" in the 1602 edition of that play; namely, "The Restraint by Authority" of which Jonson expressly complains.

'When the collective editions of Jonson and Shakespeare were issued, in 1616 and 1623 respectively, there was no longer any necessity of suppressing general allusions to the long-past quarrel of the theatres. But there did exist the strongest reason why Shakespeare's editors should not have cared to give wanton offence to the most influential poet of the day, the generous supporter of their enterprise, by restoring excised and forgotten bits of personal ridicule. I believe, therefore, that the purge which made Jonson bewray his credit, the blow with which Shakespeare closed the War of the Theatres, was to be found in "Hamlet" as that play was presented in Cambridge, London, and elsewhere, in 1601-1602. I believe that it lay in the power of Shakespeare's literary executors, Heming and Condell, to preserve this passage, as they preserved the general quizzing of the little eyases, in their authoritative edition of the play. There can be no doubt, however, that in leaving to oblivion such a piece of transitory satire, which, even though not very unfriendly, may have been very humiliating to Jonson, the editors would have been faithfully observing the wish of the dead poet and the obvious proprieties of the situation. In view of the magnificent eulogy which Jonson was even at the moment contributing to their edition, the raking up of animosities of twenty years' standing would have been nothing short of unparadonable.'

J. W. CUNLIFFE.

University of Wisconsin.

GÜNTHER JACOBY, *Herder als Faust*. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1911.

Jacoby's book is an attempt to prove that up to the scene in Auerbach's Cellar Faust's outward and inward experiences were the experiences of Herder,—not the Herder ordinarily